UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FILED

1/10/24 9:03 am

. Case No. 22-20823-GLT CLERK

U LOCK INC,

U.S. BANKRUPT(CY

5414 U.S. Steel Tower

COURT - WDPA

600 Grant Street

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Debtor.

January 4, 2024

10:05 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF #501 MOTION TO CONTINUE/RESCHEDULE HEARING ON THE CONSENT MOTION TO APPROVE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 9019 OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE

(DOC. NO. 345)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGORY L. TADDONIO UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

IN RE:

For Christine Biros: Bernstein-Burkley, P.C.

By: ROBERT S. BERNSTEIN, ESQ. 601 Grant Street, Ste 9th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Chapter 7

Trustee:

Office of the U.S. Trustee By: ROBERT H. SLONE, ESQ.

223 South Maple Avenue Greensburg, PA 15601

For Shanni Snyder: The Lynch Law Group LLC

By: JOHN PATRICK LACHER, ESQ.

501 Smith Drive, Suite 3 Cranberry Twp, PA 16066

For George Snyder: By: GEORGE SNYDER - Pro se

PO Box 15

Irwin, PA 15642

ECRO: Hayley Smith

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

This is the Motion to Continue or Reschedule a

25

Okay.

1 Hearing on the Consent Motion to Approve the Settlement 2 Agreement between Christine Biros and the Trustee involving 3 several Claims and I have Responses that have been filed to that Motion by Shanni Snyder and George Snyder.

Before I get into the heart of the issues here, I just wanted to get some brief explanatory information from the Trustee. And this is I think taken from the Status Report and the prior Hearing we had last August or so in this.

My understanding is that Trustee has paid some of the 10 real estate taxes on this parcel and I wanted to verify with 11 \parallel Mr. Slone what the amounts of those payments were and what 12 periods those covered.

MR. SLONE: Yes, Your Honor. The Tax Claim Bureau was paid I believe it was May of 2023. The amount was \$28,028.75.

> THE COURT: Okay. So, you paid \$28,028.75?

MR. SLONE: 75 cents.

18 THE COURT: I'm sorry. You're cutting out a little

So, what was the cents? 19

4

5

6

7

9

13

15

16

17

20

25

MR. SLONE: I'm sorry. \$28,028.75.

21 THE COURT: Okay. And, again, confirm for me the 22 period that that applied to.

23 That was -- I'll get that out, hold on. MR. SLONE: 24 \parallel That was the periods from 2019 to 2022.

THE COURT: Okay. And that's the extent of what's

1 been paid? 2 MR. SLONE: Yes. Has there been any other disbursements 3 THE COURT: 4 from the Estate other than that? 5 MR. SLONE: Yes. I paid myself a part of the Attorney's fee, which was approved by the Court, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Is that with the sale? I don't recall when that --8 9 MR. SLONE: Yes. I was paid \$18,972. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And what was the basis for paying 11 the real estate taxes? 12 MR. SLONE: That was part of the Agreement and at the Hearing on 4/13/23 on Page 39 it says, "I'm saying that the distribution would be withheld with the exception that if the 14 Trustee wishes to proceed with paying the Tax Claim to the Tax Claim Bureau, he is free to do that." 16 17 Also prior to paying those taxes I contacted the $18\parallel$ party, Mr. Lacher I talked to in the Bernstein office, and I 19 believe William Otto, to pay those taxes, and then sent a receipt of the payment afterwards, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, thank you, Mr. 22 Slone. 23 This is the Motion to bring forward again the Court's 24 consideration of the Settlement Motion and in the Motion it's 25 been represented that some of these items may have been

1 resolved through themselves and then other items, Christine 2 Biros is asking the Court to consider again and approve.

So, let me hear from the parties at this point and then we'll proceed from there. Mr. Bernstein.

3

4

5

6

11

12

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. So we, just to be clear, we are not seeking any action with regard to the property taxes, the real estate taxes. Our understanding was after the April 13th Hearing it made sense for the Trustee to pay them. This was what was included in Ms. Biros' Claim 10 Number 2 and we're not seeking to go forward on that.

Likewise, Ms. Biros has Claims Number 3 and 4 that are pre-petition Unsecured Claims, one for rent for a pre-petition period, and the other for environmental remediation, both of which we are clear from the Status Conference in August and what's happened since then, they're out of the money. The Unsecured Creditors are not receiving anything here.

So, that was the subject, that's really what led up to our Motion. We have the Administrative Claim. The April 13 Hearing almost resolved the 9019 Motion. I think the Court was very close to approving some or all of the settlements. avoidance action that was pending created sufficient uncertainty that the Court continued the Motion. During that Hearing the Court suggested the Trustee could pay the real 25 | estate taxes and he subsequently did, as he said. And the

1 Motion on for today, we're seeking only the Administrative Claim approval. The others are either moot or irrelevant.

3

10

11

16

19

21

22

23

24

25

In the past the Court has expressed concerns about the level of animosity and litigation over what was a very 5 small Estate and has turned out to be very small. Ms. Biros 6 has tried to explain that much of her activity has resulted from the practices of the Snyders to litigate everything, everywhere, as many times as they can. And, of course, that's the basis for her action, RICO action in the District Court.

Today we see evidence of that strategy from the Snyders again. We filed what we thought was a simple innocuous request for a hearing on the \$18,000 Administrative Right Claim, and the Snyders both filed lengthy Objections to all of the Claims and lengthy Objections to the Motion, referring to all the Claims.

While George Snyder holds an Administrative Claim 17 which might give him standing to object to the Unsecured Claims, Shanni Snyder doesn't have a Claim. We don't think she has standing. In any event, we'll deal with Mr. Snyder's Objections when they are heard.

I'm sorry, I wasn't clear. He not only filed an Objection to the Motion, but he filed yesterday Objections to the Claim 3 and Claim 4, which doesn't make any sense to us, but we'll deal with it when we deal with it.

For today we're seeking an opportunity to argue the

11

13

15

21

22

24

1 9019 Settlement Agreement with the Trustee on the 2 administrative rent. If this is the Hearing to do that, we're 3 prepared to go forward. If this is a Hearing to set a Hearing, $4 \parallel$ we're prepared to deal with that. We just, we want to help 5 move the case forward. We're trying to end this.

With regard to the substance of the 9019, we'd say 7 that we incorporate the arguments made on April 13th. Settlement of the Administrative Rent Claim is well within the range of reasonableness and meets the Martin factors, as 10 outlined on the 13th. Ms. Biros is the owner of the Real Property. The Debtor and the Trustee had possession of some or all of that Real Property for approximately nine months post-petition. \$2,000 per month is a reasonable compromise of the Rental Value for that possession.

The Court was ready to approve the Claim on April 13th, but heard arguments from the Snyders that a possible 17 favorable result on the Adversary might somehow allow an unjust result, if the Settlements had been approved at that time. 18 This seems no longer even remotely likely. We would ask the Court to approve the Settlement for the reasons heard on April 13th.

I'd just like to add at that Status Conference in 23 August, when we were discussing the administrative insolvency of this Chapter 7 case, we expressed concern that the Court might find the need to moot our Objection to Shanni Snyder's

1 Claim.

2

4

5

6

10

11

13

14

15

21

22

24

We encourage the Court to continue to make the 3 Decision since it had been fully briefed and argued, and the Court indicated that it would.

8

Since that time, the District Court has affirmed this Court's Decision on the Dismissal in the Adversary. We hope the Court is near to releasing a Decision on the Shanni Snyder Claim Objection so that we can begin to deal with the appeal process which we have no doubt will ensue.

So, we would ask the Court to approve today the \$18,000 Settlement of the Admin Claim so that the Trustee can have clarity on what the Administrative Expenses are that have to be prorated.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Well I -- to 16 answer your first question, I am prepared to move forward on 17 \parallel the merits of this today for two reasons. One is, I previously had a full hearing on the Settlement Motion before, and took it under advisement at the time and figured that it was ready for consideration pending the Court's consideration of other factors.

Related to that though you mentioned just now that 23 the District Court affirmed my Dismissal of the Adversary Proceeding. I wasn't aware of that. Is that -- I mean, I was 25 aware that the --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm pretty sure I saw that Decision last week, Your Honor, from --

THE COURT: I think that was my Decision on George Snyder's Claim.

> MS. BIROS: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

23

MR. BERNSTEIN: I may have misspoken.

THE COURT: Okay. Because I --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I apologize, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure I didn't miss something because that would be something that I, you know, certainly would want to take into consideration.

MR. BERNSTEIN: We're fully expecting it to be affirmed.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sorry, I may have jumped the gun.

THE COURT: No, that's fine. And then, secondly, I 17 \parallel think I've given the parties ample time to be heard. You know 18 this was scheduled for a Hearing. This Motion was filed in early December and now here we are a month later and the parties have had time to be heard on this and have voiced full throated Responses and Objections. So, I think there has been adequate due process afforded here.

So, let me ask you specifically the type of relief 24 \parallel that you are asking for. You are asking that basically I would approve the Settlement to the extent it applies to the

4

6

7

12

16

17

18 **I**

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Administrative Rent Claim and then do nothing further on the other two Claims or what --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct, Your Honor. We'd like the \$18,000 Administrative Claim to be allowed, to be paid on final 5 distribution. And the Motion could be dismissed as to the other three Claims, the 9019 Motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. Let me hear from Shanni Snyder. And at this point, you know, I've not issued a Ruling yet on the Claim Objection, so she still has a 10 \parallel Claim at this point, so I think has an ability to be heard. 11 So, Mr. Lacher?

MR. LACHER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning. Ι would just point out that at the time we received the Motion, I think there's been, you know, a lot of clarification today in regards to the relief being sought.

The Motion itself was fashioned as a Motion to Reset a Hearing. So, was it a request to set a Hearing, or was it a request for the relief? Your Honor has made that clear. And I assumed all along that this would be the Hearing on the relief.

But there were other pieces of confusion in the Motion just to explain why we're here. The Motion seeked (sic) an approval of the Settlement Agreement with the Trustee which not only included the Administrative Rent Claim, but it included a pre-petition Rent Claim, a Real Estate Tax Claim,

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

1 and an environmental cleanup. So, the Motion itself, as I read it, was not limited to an Environmental Cleanup Claim.

And further still, the proposed Order with the Motion included provisions to schedule a Hearing on the matter, but could be read in a way with a contradictory provision just simply approving the full Settlement.

So, the Objection, the first and foremost, was Ms. Snyder wanted clarification of what exact relief was being sought. And I've heard today that it's limited to the 10 post-petition Administrative Rent Claim.

The continuance to my Objection here would be that Ms. Snyder opposes an allowance until the appeal process plays out in regard to who the actual owner of the property is. believe we need a final determination of ownership and a final accounting of the purpose of payments made by the Trustee.

And I'll just point out some examples. If Biros turns out not to be the property owner, why is she entitled to rent? If Biros is not the property owner, why does she have any connection on an Environmental Cleanup Claim.

If Biros is the property owner, why would U LOCK pay real estate taxes in regard to property owned by Biros?

If Biros became an owner later in the process but not from the inception, as this Court has ruled, then she owned the property but she's getting rent for periods where she didn't -the rent may not -- if the property was granted to repay her

loan, then the rent she seeks would result in a windfall.

1

2

3

5

6

7

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I will agree -- by the way, I want to make this very Mr. Slone is a terrific Trustee. Mr. Slone absolutely clear. contacted me about the payment of real estate taxes. in no way, shape, or form an attack on Mr. Slone.

I will say though that we have confusing matters. Certainly Mr. Slone did and should have paid any real estate taxes owed by the Estate. But it's unclear, and again, because who is the owner of the property? When did each party become 10 owner of the property or not become owner of the property? You 11 know, what taxes were paid?

U LOCK should not be paying real estate taxes for property owed, owned, pardon me, by Ms. Biros, or if they should, I don't really understand why.

So, again, Your Honor, I am simply asking the Court to maybe take a wait and see position until things are fully clarified and then we can deal with these Claims.

And you know, again, I acknowledge there's not a lot of money on hand, but these issues, as far as I'm concerned, are up in the air.

THE COURT: Well but that seems to be what --

MR. LACHER: So we would just ask Your Honor to --

THE COURT: -- Attorney Bernstein is proposing though is to allow the Administrative Claim and then take a wait and 25 \parallel see on the other two. If the other two or three Claims are out

1 of the money, then it's not really relevant at this point.

But I have said before and it still appears to me 3 that there would be an entitlement to administrative rent for the Estate's use of the property during the post-petition 5 period until stay relief is granted. And so is there anything further you wanted to say on that count?

MR. LACHER: No, Your Honor, I think I've just pointed out that knowing who the owner was and when they became the owner --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LACHER: -- might be relevant to calculating 12 those figures.

> THE COURT: Okay.

2

7

9

10

11

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

MR. LACHER: But, otherwise, Your Honor was loud and 15 clear at the last hearing. And I did want to explain I as a lawyer was genuinely confused reading the Motion as to what we were seeking here today. So, that is my request of the Court. I would ask that you put it all on hold, but that's all I have to say, Your Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LACHER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Snyder, anything else you 23 wish to offer? I mean I do hope you -- I read your Pleading and saw that you were having some health issues, so I wish you 25 well with respect to those. But anything that you wanted to

1 address with the Court today?

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SNYDER: I appreciate that, Your Honor. For the 3 most part I agree with the position of Shanni Snyder in her And I would just like to add my position is the same thing. I sort of think it's premature until the process is over.

But also that the Claim I feel should be reduced by the rent and the property taxes, or the rent should be reduced by the property taxes.

And the reason we keep, you know, I keep feeling, you know, not to want to litigate every thing, but I'm compelled to because everything is misstated in court. Just even as recent as today he said most or all the property use was used by U LOCK. We really used a very small percentage of the property and I had included that in a diagram of one of my filings.

And also I was kicked off. U LOCK wasn't even allowed on the property for so many months and, you know. to state today that I had use of most of the property, U LOCK had most use of the property is not, I don't think, correct.

A lot of tenants lost valuable things, and U LOCK was really on the hook for everything. They sort of bulldozed over down there, so, that was all.

And if you do set a hearing in the future then, like I said, I have to get my aorta replaced and reconstructed so that's going to be a couple month process, or maybe about a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

21

22

24

1 month -- a week in the hospital, maybe a month in a recovery, and then -- so I would -- I have a doctor's appointment today, and then the process will start. So, somewhere in mid-March would probably be great, or after.

THE COURT: Well, you're also welcome to continue to participate via Zoom if that's more convenient, but you know --MR. SNYDER: Okay.

THE COURT: Otherwise, you know, I'm going to proceed on what we have in front of us and I appreciate your comments.

Having heard all the parties I do find as a supplement to what I've previously stated on the record on the initial Hearing on the Settlement Motion, that there is sufficient grounds to grant the Settlement on a limited basis.

I do think that Christine Biros and the Trustee have shown that the Martin standards are satisfied with respect to the Administrative Rent Claim.

I do appreciate the compromise that was made there 18 and the compromise indeed is within the Court's expectation of what a reasonable rent would be for the property and for the use that the Debtor had or the Estate had of that property during the time that it occupied the premises.

So, I am prepared to approve the Settlement as it 23 pertains to the Administrative Rent Claim.

I'll deny the remainder of the Settlement without 25 prejudice and we can determine later on whether or not it's

5

6

7

9

10

13

15

17

21

22

23

1 worth going down the road of evaluating the merits of the other Claims given that the Estate does not appear to be growing and $3 \parallel$ is what it is and there may not be enough money to pay all the Administrative Claims at this point.

Having said that, I do find it necessary to, and perhaps helpful, to give some preliminary comments to the parties, again, just some ideas that I have from looking at this and it's a bit of a continuation from what I had observed before.

But with respect to the pre-petition Rent Claim I 11 think there is some questions and concerns that the Court would 12 have in terms of the entitlement there in light of the fact that this was a Constructive Trust and the property was awarded to Ms. Biros because U LOCK was unable to pay the Loan.

And so, from that standpoint Ms. Biros was a Lender 16 and instead of getting repayment was given the Deed to the property. I'm not entirely convinced at this point that that would entitle her to pre-petition rent on top of that. So, that's a hill that will need to be overcome, in my view, if we ever get to the merits of that Claim. Again, you know, it may not reach that point based on where the Estate is, but that's something I want to at least tell you where I'm at right now.

And then as far as the Environmental Claim is 24 concerned, I do think that it's been a showing, at least at this point, that there are some environmental concerns there on 1 the property.

2

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

The question I would have at this point is, what 3 proof is there that U LOCK caused those environmental issues or is ultimately liable for any environmental remediation that 5 would be necessary? So, that's something else that would need 6 to be addressed if the day and time comes that we would go into 7 the merits of that Claim in full.

But, otherwise, as to the matter at hand, I do find that there is a sufficient basis to grant the relief on a limited basis, and so I'll enter an Order to that effect later today.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. May I raise one brief point?

> THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Unrelated to this Motion. Maybe get some quidance. Earlier in the case in November of '22 the Court approved a Stipulation between George Snyder and the Trustee that provided that George Snyder would be responsible for preparing and filing tax returns.

There was, I believe, one tax return filed during the case and it was for 2016 and it contained, among other improper assertions, it contained the assertions that Ms. Biros was an owner of U LOCK, and so it disclosed her Social Security Number. It made some other what we think are improper 25 allegations.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

12

14

17 **I**

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

We think at this point it's clear that the Court can no longer rely on Mr. Snyder to file the tax returns and we'd like the Trustee to file tax returns, including an Amendment of 2016 to correct those errors.

And we realize that we can't unring the bell as far as it being on a piece of paper filed with the IRS somewhere, but we can correct the record by the Trustee filing proper tax returns, even if many of the numbers are unknown because the records don't exist.

So, I don't know, we have an existing Order that says 11 \parallel Mr. Snyder will assist the Trustee. We could file another Motion to require the Trustee to file the tax returns. Can we get some guidance from the Court on this?

THE COURT: I think it would be best to do a Motion with respect to that so we have notice and opportunity to be heard. And then, you know, has there been a preliminary discussion with Trustee Slone on this?

> MR. BERNSTEIN: Not yet.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think that would be advisable as well and that might help shape the discussion and if there is consent that can be gained on that one issue, then that would seem to be appropriate. So, I think that's the best way to proceed.

> Thank you, Your Honor. MR. BERNSTEIN:

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else from the

1 parties at this point?

MR. SNYDER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Then I will enter an Order on the pending matter at this point and then we'll wait to see where we are. And as I indicated before, I do have a couple things that are still under advisement and the Court will be getting those out as quickly as possible.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, thank you very much, everyone.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Have a good day.

THE COURT: You, too.

MR. SLONE: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. LACHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Your Honor.

15

16

17

19

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I, JANET D. PERSONS, court approved transcriber, $18 \parallel$ certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter and to the best of my ability.

21

- 22 /s/ Janet D. Persons
- 23 JANET D. PERSONS
- 24 J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: January 9, 2024

25